

REMARKS

The claims are amended in view of the interview with the Examiner on October 17, 2003 to further clarify and improve the claim recitations.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claim 1-18 and 25-34 are pending.

Claim 1, 3, 27, 30, 33 and 34 are amended, and, thus, claims 1-18 and 25-34 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment. The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objects to the specification, page 3, lines 24-26 for indefiniteness. The specification is amended taking into consideration the Examiner's comments. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

The specification is also amended to correct an error by removing the section heading "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" at page 3, line 23, and inserting "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" in page 2, between lines 26 and 27. The amendment corrects the specification regarding the summary of the invention description, and support for the amendment can be found at page 2, the paragraph starting at line 27, disclosing a first aspect of the present invention after the newly inserted summary of the invention section heading.

35 USC 112 REJECTIONS

35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejects claims 1-18, 25, 26 and 32 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for allegedly not being enabled.

In regard to the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejections, the Examiner asserts that the recitation, "real-time" is not disclosed in the specification. However, clearly processes of the claimed invention are performed dynamically or real-time as described, for example, in page 2, lines 32-35; page 23, lines 17-24; page 34; and FIGS. 23-24 of the Application. Execution of the FIG. 1 functional blocks by a computer is clearly described in the specification, for example, in the FIG. 16 flow chart, and description thereof on page 20, line 31, regarding how these

functional blocks dynamically interact. The recitation “real-time” emphasizes that processes of the invention, as embodied in the functional blocks of FIG. 1, are dynamically executed by a computer, to further distinguish over the scheduling by Fargher and Matsuzaki that are driven by scheduling jobs. In contrast to Fargher and Matsuzaki, the claimed invention schedules a worker group by reciting “a scheduler establishing the job-object conditions and scheduling each worker group to process the job objects, according to each worker group procedure defined in the job definition form.”

In regard to the claim 1 recitations, “form generator,” and “representing a group of workers as a job,” FIGS. 8, 9 and 36, expressly describe that the system of the invention uses a job definition form that treats job resource information according to “worker groups” (i.e., “PROCEDURE: GROUP A (Job A1), ... GROUP B (Job B1), ...”; or GROUP: C, PROCEDURE JOB: Development A). Page 8, lines 16-20 of the Application disclose that the procedure memory 1 stores and updates a job definition form 11 that defines the period, members, processes, windows, objects, and data of each job of each group. See also, page 16, lines 14-20 of the Application. Further, page 11, line 32 to page 12, line 2, expressly describes function of the job definition form 11 as controlling the jobs of all worker groups according to worker group by worker group and that each schedule is made according to the job definition forms.

Regarding the claim 4 recitation, “emergency worker group,” the specification is absolutely clear that a group includes members who are workers. See, for example, page 2, lines 27-30. The emergency group 6 is allowed to access every resource of every group, in response to a trouble notice from the job monitor 2 (page 9, lines 21-24; page 14, lines 6-13; and FIG. 3B).

Regarding the claim 6 recitations, “job definition form defines group permission information,” and “request unit,” the specification describes that the job definition form 11 defines group permission information, that a group sends a request to the job monitor 2 to access a resource, and that the job monitor 2 determines whether the request is acceptable according to the job definition form 11 (see, page 9, line 25 to page 10, line 11). Such acceptability is based upon the permission information in the job definition form 11 (page 12, lines 14-24). FIGS. 36(A) and (B) is a job definition form, which expressly discloses permission information of GROUP C performing JOB A for each resource, such as WINDOW, OBJECT, DATA (page 27, lines 14-18).

Withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejections is respectfully requested.

35 USC 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejects claims 1-18, 25, 26, 29 and 32 for indefiniteness under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Examiner alleges that the claim recitations have an indefinite meaning. The independent claims 1, 27, 30, 33 and 34 are amended taking into consideration the Examiner's comments. The Applicants respectfully assert the claims clearly recite the invention idea of processing jobs based upon worker group by worker group (i.e., "job definition forms that define worker groups to process the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions, each job definition form representing a group of workers as a job," FIGS. 8, 9 and 36 of the Application).

Withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections is respectfully requested.

35 USC 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3, 27, 30, 33, and 34 are amended.

Claims 1, 27, 30, 33 and 34 are independent.

Fargher & Matsuzaki

The Examiner rejects independent claims 1, 27, 30, 33 and 34 (and dependent claims 3 and 5) under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher (US Patent No. 5,826,040) in view of Matsuzaki (US Patent No. 5,767,848).

In response to the previous amended recitation of job definition forms, the Examiner asserts that use of forms to manage projects is well known, and as such the use of job definition forms defining worker groups that process the job objects according to job-object conditions are implicit in the description of any system managing groups of workers (page 4 of the Action). The Examiner also relies on Matsuzaki's FIG. 1 and column 5, line 35, to column 7, line 65.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization as follows:

In regard to the Examiner's assertion of forms used to manage projects similar to the claimed invention, the Applicants request documentary evidence to support the well known assertion. In particular, the Applicants respectfully request documentary evidence of such alleged inherency in compliance with the USPTO's February 21, 2002 Memorandum on Relying on Facts Which are Not of Record as Common Knowledge or for Taking Official Notice. It is respectfully asserted that such prior art systems are designed according to jobs and groups of workers assigned to the jobs, and only provide worker group management as an attribute, if at

all, for example, by allowing changing members assigned to jobs as in Matsuzaki's column 14, and do not provide resource management (e.g., resource sharing while maintaining security) among the worker groups. In contrast, in the claimed invention, worker groups are defined to perform jobs such that a group of workers is represented as a job with respect to the system managing the jobs performed by the worker groups.

Using claim 1, which is amended for further clarity, as an example, the claims clearly recite, "a computer system real-time managing object-oriented system objects as job objects among groups of workers as worker groups in communication with each other via networked computers, said computer system comprising: ... job definition forms that define worker groups to process the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions, each job definition form representing a group of workers as a job." Matsuzaki's FIG. 1 and column 5, line 35 to column 7, line 65, disclose development activity models, which represent jobs to be processes, and Matsuzaki's development activity models are not "representing a group of workers as a job" to manage job processing by the group of workers. Therefore, Matsuzaki manages jobs according to the jobs as shown in Matsuzaki's FIG. 2 and column 7, lines 12-28. In particular, Matsuzaki manages jobs according to development activities (column 13, lines 47-53; and column 13, line 54 to column 14, line 65).

In regard to Fargher, the Examiner admits that Fargher does not disclose the recitation, "job definition forms that define worker groups to process the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions, each job definition form representing a group of workers as a job," which is because Fargher also manages jobs according to the jobs, which is evidenced by Fargher's disclosure in column 7, lines 20-38 describing the plan representation according to processes or piece of work to be performed.

Therefore, using claim 1 as an example, both Fargher and Matsuzaki are silent on the claimed recitation, "job definition forms that define worker groups to process the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions, each job definition form representing a group of workers as a job." To highlight the difference between the claimed invention and the relied upon references, see page 16, lines 21-30 and FIG. 9, which disclose that if each group carries out a single job, the name of the job is omitted and only the name of the group is specified. Otherwise, if a group carries out a plurality of jobs, the name of the group is specified with each job name assigned to the group.

Further, scheduling jobs drives the scheduling by Fargher and Matsuzaki. In contrast to Fargher and Matsuzaki, in the claimed invention scheduling worker groups drives the

scheduling by reciting “a scheduler establishing the job-object conditions and scheduling each worker group to process the job objects, according to each worker group procedure defined in the job definition form.”

More particularly, the present invention defines jobs according to worker groups performing the jobs to simplify sharing of resources (objects of jobs or job objects) among the worker groups (see, page 8, lines 16-35; page 9, line 32 to page 10, line 17; and page 11, line 25 to page 12, line 17) as well as to simplify movement of workers among the worker groups (see, dependent claim 3; page 8, line 36 to page 9, line 10). Neither Fargher, nor the Matsuzaki storage units 2, 3 and 4, disclose or suggest the recitations:

... job definition forms that define worker groups to process the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions, each job definition form representing a group of workers as a job; ...

a scheduler establishing the job-object conditions and scheduling each worker group to process the job objects, according to each worker group procedure defined in the job definition form ... (emphasis added).

Matsuzaki only provides a schedule based upon user input and job progress, which differs from the present invention's recitation, “scheduling each worker group to process the job objects according to each worker group procedure defined in the job definition form.” In other words, Matsuzaki does not schedule worker groups. For example, Matsuzaki's schedule estimating unit 7 estimates development schedule (column 5, lines 64-66). Further, Matsuzaki's schedule allocating unit 320 provides schedule terms with reference to data acquired by development activities in the past development projects. Therefore, Matsuzaki does not perform the operations of the present invention to establish the job-object conditions and to schedule worker groups to process the job objects, according to each worker group procedure defined in the job definition form.

Fargher's scheduler 18 does not establish job-object conditions and schedules according to each worker group procedure defined in the job definition form, because Fargher's scheduler 18 operates according to status of works (column 6, lines 4-27). The job definition form of the claimed invention defines worker groups that process the jobs, and not workers assigned to the jobs as in Fargher and Matsuzaki.

Furthermore, neither Fargher, nor Matsuzaki's storage units 2, 3, and 4, disclose or suggest the amended claim 1 recitation,

... a job monitor real-time monitoring job processing by the worker groups and real-time controlling sharing of the job-objects among the worker groups while maintaining security of the job objects according to the job-object conditions managed by the resource manager, thereby for a first worker group inhibiting access to the job objects thereof from another worker group to which permission to use the job objects of the first worker group is not allocated (claim 1).

Fargher and Matsuzaki do not discuss maintaining security of job objects. The Applicants note that Fargher and Matsuzaki do not even use the phrases "permission" or "security" with respect to any job resources. Matsuzaki in column 14 only discloses accommodating email inquiries among members, and does not disclose "controlling sharing of the job-objects among the worker groups while maintaining security of the job objects according to the job-object conditions managed by the resource manager."

According to the present invention, worker groups are defined to perform jobs such that a group of workers is represented as a job with respect to the system managing the jobs performed by the worker groups (see, independent claims 1, 27, 30, 33 and 34). A benefit of the present invention's job definition form is for developing software in a short time, because quick changes in members and groups with resource changes are required, which can be achieved by easily changing members in the job definition form and the resources allocated to the members. Managing worker groups when the system manages a job according to the job tasks as in the prior art, can be more difficult by requiring separately maintaining and updating worker groups in relation to job tasks.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 27, 30, 33 and 34 are allowable.

Further, dependent claim 3 recites movement of workers among the worker groups, which is not disclosed or suggested by any of the relied upon references (see, page 8, line 36 to page 9, line 10; page 18, lines 18 to page 19, line 18). Claim 3 recites, "a rearranging unit that manages worker rearrangements among the worker groups and manages the job-object conditions of the rearranged worker groups according to progress of the jobs from the job monitor, wherein said job monitor monitors the job processing and the job objects of the worker groups according to information from said rearranging unit." Accordingly, at least claim 3 is allowable.

IBM Bulletin

Dependent claims 4, 6, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, and "IBM Disclosure Bulletin." Page 5, item 7 of the Action.

The IBM Bulletin does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claims 4, 6 and 11-15, because the IBM Bulletin does not relate to a system for managing job objects among worker groups. For example, regarding claim 6, the IBM Bulletin is silent on permission requests among worker groups to use a job object from another worker group. The IBM Bulletin's ACL permission bits do not perform a request operation to obtain permission among worker groups. See also, claim 13. At least claims 6 and 13 are allowable.

Rapazo

Dependent claims 2, 28-29, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin and Rapazo (PC Week). Page 8, item 8 of the Action. Rapazo still does not disclose managing worker group rights with respect to job objects. Rapazo is silent on worker group rights.

Gaskill, Morishima, Waldren, Zinsmeyer, and Weber

Dependent claims 7-9 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin, Persham, (US Patent No. 5,260,986), Hwang (US Patent No. 5,530,892), Gaskill (US Patent No. 5,440,559), Morishima (US Patent No. 5,589,956) and D'Agosto (US Patent No. 4,975,896). Persham, Hwang, Gaskill, Morishima, and Gaskill are newly cited and relied upon.

Dependent claims 10, 26, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin, Waldren (US Patent No. 4,884,219), Zinsmeyer (US Patent No. 3,927,800) and Morishima. Waldren and Zinsmeyer are newly cited and relied upon.

Dependent claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin, Waldren, Zinsmeyer, Morishima, and Weber (US Patent No. 4,995,071). Weber is newly cited and relied upon.

Persham, Hwang, Gaskill, Morishima, D'Agosto, Waldren, Zinsmeyer and Weber are cited as documentary evidence supporting the obviousness rejections of claims 7-10, 17, 18, 25 and 26, in response to the documentary evidence request in the previous Amendment. Generally, the Examiner cites these references to support the efficient and rapid communication

among workers in various work groups (page 10, last paragraph of the Action).

Although these references disclose various communication mechanisms among people, such communication mechanisms are not used in connection with obtaining permissions to use objects (e.g., resources) of a job in a job management computer network system. For example, D'Agosto discloses a telephone messaging system, Weber discloses a video conferencing system, and Pershan discloses a telephone notification system. In other words, the primary references of Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin and Rapozo are completely silent on the claimed recitation, "real-time monitoring job processing by the worker groups and real-time controlling sharing of the job-objects among the worker groups while maintaining security of the job objects according to the job-object conditions managed by the resource manager," thereby not suggesting combination with Persham, Hwang, Gaskill, Morishima, D'Agosto, Waldren, Zinsmeyer and Weber. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine various communication techniques among people in obtaining permissions to use job objects in a job management computer network system. More particularly, the relied upon references do not disclose or suggest using visual and auditory means to share and maintain, in real-time, the security of information objects (resources) among groups of workers that are in communication with each other through a network (see also, page 1, lines 34-36 and FIG. 23 of the Application).

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-18 and 25-34, and allowance of claims 1-18 and 25-34 is respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10/20/2003

By: 

Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501